

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1-13 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-13 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 5 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,061,698, issued to Chadha et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Chadha"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites "referring to a parameter which specifies an area to be processed, a word line to be replaced in the area, and a word line to be substituted for the replaced word line, to determine the area to be processed in the read original document.....and substituting the word line specified by the parameter for the word line to be replaced in the area." Support for the amended language of claim 1 is found in at least paragraphs [0021]-[0024] of the present application. The Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features are not disclosed or suggested by Chadha.

Chadha merely discloses a method of combining a document constructed with a visual HTML tool with data scripts constructed with a separate visual tool. A linkage tool is used to combine the document and the data scripts (Column 5, Line 27 through Column 6, Line 15). In order to embed the data scripts in the document, the linkage tool searches sequentially for all comment statements containing special tags in the HTML language. The special tags are apparently generic, and merely provide a slot for a data script to be chosen by a user. When one of the generic special tags are located, the user is prompted to choose one of the pre-constructed data scripts to be embedded into the document. Thus, there is no parameter referred to at all in Chadha, and further there is certainly nothing even somewhat similar to a parameter which specifies an area to be processed, a word line to be replaced in the area, and a word line to be substituted for the replaced word line. Further, as Chadha does not disclose or suggest referring to any such parameter, Chadha does not disclose or suggest substituting a word line specified by the parameter for the word line to be replaced in the area.

This is in direct contrast to the language of claim 1, which recites "referring to a parameter which specifies an area to be processed, a word line to be replaced in the area, and a

word line to be substituted for the replaced word line, to determine the area to be processed in the read original document.....and substituting the word line specified by the parameter for the word line to be replaced in the area.” As Chadha does not disclose or suggest these features, there is the necessity of extra processes which are not required in claim 1 of the present application.

In more detail, an area to be processed is not “specified” at all in Chadha. As already explained in this Response, the linkage tool merely searches for any and all special tags in the document one by one, which is in direct contrast to an area to be processed being specified by a parameter. While the Examiner has characterized the results of the linkage tool’s search for the generic special tags as identifying a specified area, this would properly be understood by one skilled in the art as being an identification of an area by the linkage tool. This is in direct contrast to “referring to a parameter which specifies an area to be processed,” as is recited in claim 1 of the present application. Thus, while the linkage tool of Chadha performs a process to find any areas in which to embed a data script, the specification of the area to be processed is already included in the parameter of claim 1. In other words, the specification of the area to be processed in the parameter of claim 1 has been defined before any combination with the original document. Whereas claim 1 of the present application allows a dynamic document to operate without embedded area modifying instructions, such as the data scripts embedded in a document through the method of Chadha, Chadha merely allows a user to choose script files to be embedded in a document, and those embedded data scripts are responsible for modifying the document when viewed by a viewer.

Further, because the user chooses the data scripts to be embedded in the document in Chadha, there is no “substituting the word line specified by the parameter for the word line to be replaced in the area.” First, as explained above, there is no specified area to be processed contained in the instruction to begin with in Chadha. Secondly, the manner of modification is not even defined by the linkage tool of Chadha, much less a parameter, but rather is defined by the user.

Therefore, Chadha does not disclose or suggest at least the features discussed above. Accordingly, Chadha does not disclose every element of the Applicants’ claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Chadha does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Chadha, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claim 6 of the present application, as amended, recites “referring to a parameter which specifies an area to be processed, a word line to be replaced in the area, and a word line to be

substituted for the replaced word line, to determine the area to be processed in the read original document", as well as other features similar to those of claim 1. As discussed above in regard to claim 1, Chadha does not disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 also patentably distinguishes over Chadha.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, and claim 7 depends from claim 6. These dependent claims include all of the features of the independent claims upon which they respectively claim, plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by Chadha. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 and 7 also patentably distinguish over Chadha.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 7 on page 5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022, issued to Hobbs (hereinafter referred to as "Hobbs"). In item 8 on pages 5-6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha as applied to claims 1 and 6, and further in view of Homer et al., "Instant HTML", copyright 1997, pages 76-107 (hereinafter referred to as "Homer"). In item 9 on pages 6-8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133637, issued to Popp et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Popp"). In item 10 on page 8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha in view of Popp as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Homer. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As discussed in the previous section of this Response, claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over Chadha. Further, the Applicant respectfully submits that the deficiencies of Chadha in regard to claims 1 and 6 are not cured by Hobbs, Homer, or Popp, taken either alone or in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 also patentably distinguish over all the references cited in the Examiner's §103 rejections.

Claim 9 of the present application recites "a parameter which specifies an area to be processed, a word line to be replaced in the area, and a word line to be substituted for the replaced word line, to determine the area to be processed in the read document," as well as other similar features to claim 1. As discussed in regard to claim 1, Chadha does not disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 9. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1, claim 8 depends from claim 6, and claims 10-13 depend from claim 9. These dependent claims include all of the features of the independent claims upon which they respectively claim, plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-5, 8, and 10-13 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-13 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-13 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

07/20/06

By:

Thomas L. Jones

Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 20, 2006

STAAS & HALSEY

By: [Signature]

Date: July 20, 2006